DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 131 CG 003 031

By-McGlothlin, William H.

Toward a Rational View of Hallucinogenic Drugs.

National Association of Student Personnel Administration, Detroit, Mich.
Spons Agency-Food and Drug Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Nov 66
Note-13p.; Paper presented at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Drug Education Conference, Washington, D.C., November 7-8, 1966.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.75
Descriptors-*Drug Abuse, *Drug Legislation, *Lysergic Acid Diethylamide

The enactment of California's "LSD Bill" is presented as an example of poor judgment in drug legislation on the state level. An appraisal of the nonmedical use of hallucinogens centering around the types of users, and the results of drug use, shows that the principal social impact of hallucinogens is on the personalities and values of the users. In an examination of the consequences of legal repression as a method of drug control, the following were considered: (1) the consequences of unrestricted use or of nonpunitive controls, (2) whether the laws are enforceable, (3) whether the prescribed punishment is commensurate with the offense, and (4) the value of deterrence versus the law's unintended side effects. Legal repression at the user level will probably be reduced in the future. The society will continue to disapprove of cultist withdrawal centered around the use of drugs, but individuals who seek pleasure or growth through drugs and pursue these goals within the social order will enjoy increasing social acceptance. (Author/PS)

ED030131

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators
Drug Education Project (1966-67)
Background Papers

Toward a Rational View of Hallucinogenic Drugs[1]

William H. McGlothlin, Ph.D.

RAND Corporation and
University of Southern California

A highly predictable response to social problems in the United States is legal repression, and this is doubly so when the threat involved non-medical use of unfamiliar drugs. The rapidly expanding use of LSD is currently triggering this response in various state legislatures throughout the country. Whereas the Federal lawmakers are exercising considerable restraint, their counterparts at the state level are rushing through punitive laws on the basis of instinct rather than reason.

I have some first-hand familiarity with the recent enactment of California's "LSD bill" and I believe it illustrates some of the flaws in the instinctual approach to drug legislation. In February, Senator Donald Grunsky introduced a bill to amend the existing dangerous-drug law to include LSD and Dimethyltryptamine (DMT), thereby prohibiting their manufacture, sale, importation, or possession. The bill passed the Senate, 33-0, with virtually no debate and went to the Assembly Criminal Procedures Committee. In presenting his bill to the Committee, Senator Grunsky stated that its purpose was (1) to halt the dangerous illicit use of LSD, and (2) to prevent physicians from prescribing LSD to patients, who would take it without supervision and then (holding up a newspaper account to emphasize his point) go out and murder people like the case in New York. A committee member pointed out that LSD had never been available by prescription, and that prohibition of prescriptions was only for clarity. (The bill was in the form of an amendment to the dangerous drug law which permitted use of barbituates and amphetamines under prescription.) Senator Grunsky conceded that he must have misunderstood the one-half-page bill and rested his case on the issue of illicit use.

Committee testimony in favor of the bill was generally restrained, although lurid color photographs of a psychotic reaction to LSD were informally circulated by the Attorney General's office. The principal witness appearing on behalf of the bill testified as to the increasing incidence of LSD induced psychotic reactions resulting from medically unsupervised use. A representative of Attorney General's office testified that the law was needed to prevent antisocial acts by people under the influence of the drug. The Committee repeatedly questioned

---

1. Paper distributed at National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Drug Education Conference, Washington, D.C., November 7-8, 1966. The NASPA Drug Education Project is supported by Contract No. FDA 67-3, with the Food and Drug Administration, Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare.

CG 003 031

him regarding the principal difference between the existing Federal and proposed California laws, viz., why the former specifically exempted possession for personal use. He answered that the Federal law-enforcement agencies preferred that the states prosecute at the user level, whereas, in fact, the hearings on the Federal bill make it very clear that the intention of the law is to control manufacture and sale and not to impose criminal sanctions against the user.

The testimony in opposition to the bill was presented by two physicians, a psychologist, and a Jesuit priest. They agreed that controls on LSD manufacture and distribution were needed, but argued that outlawing use and possession would result in the prosecution of young persons whose intentions were not antisocial; that its use was often nothing more than youthful adventure; and that some of the most creative students were among those experimenting with the drug. They further argued that the fear of arrest would discourage users from seeking psychiatric aid should they need it.

The bill failed to receive the required number of votes to pass the Assembly floor, whereupon the Committee immediately came under attack. The action was labeled "irresponsible"by some state senators; Attorney General Lynch stated that LSD and other hallucinogenic drugs "present the most crucial drug problem which the U.S. has faced"; Governor Brown, Ronald Reagan, and various other political candidates announced that they favored passage of the bill, and a Los Angeles Times editorial expressed amazement that the Committee was unaware of the LSD menace. The Committee Chairman, Pearce Young, defended the action by pointing out that Federal law already prohibited manufacture and sale, and that further state laws should await the findings of an interim study group which has been established.

In the following week, the Committee defeated a move to reconsider the bill, and the attacks from law-enforcement agencies and the press mounted to new heights. The Los Angeles County District Attorney, Evelle Younger, was quoted on daily radio and TV newscasts concerning the need for LSD controls, and the Los Angeles Times ridiculed the Committee for considering such things as "motivation" for use of the drug. At the beginning of the third week, another move was made for reconsideration, and this time the beleagured Committee removed the possession clause from the bill and sent it to the Assembly floor. Their action was attached as a "watering-down" of the bill, and District Attorney Younger initiated a campaign to have the possession feature restored. This was promptly accomplished by a vote of 44-24, and the final bill passed the Assembly by 63-5.

The Los Angeles Times editorialized that the Legislature had acted properly, stating that "LSD not only can cause serious harm to the user but can also lead to very serious criminal acts", and naively concluded that the "action will keep it (LSD) in the laboratory and the hospital where it belongs." Attorney General Lynch capitalized on the victory in his political campaign: spot radio announcements pictured him as the man who protected the state from LSD and also fought the menace in Washington. As a postlude, the governors of California and Nevada vied for the honor of being the first to formalize an anti-LSD bill; the former claiming to have signed a few hours earlier, while Nevada's Sawyer claimed primacy

on the grounds that California's law was not to be effective until 90 days after the Legislature adjourned.

California's legislation was based on public instinct, which, in turn, is largely influenced by the popular press. It is reminiscent of Congress's similar approach to the marihuana threat some thirty years ago. At that time, the danger was adjudged so horrendous that the only person who suggested that the facts should be rationally studied, Dr. W.C. Woodward, was thoroughly ridiculed and ignored. Nevertheless, when the facts were eventually investigated, they failed to support most of the unfounded fears that had instigated the legislation.

The same type of "act now, think later" approach to LSD legislation is occuring in several other states. For instance, New York Assembly Speaker A.J. Travia announced that the problem was so urgent he would defer public hearings on the law until after it was passed. The chairman of New Jersey's narcotic drug study commission, C.W. Sandiman, would go even further by filing suit in Federal court to prohibit further articles on the subject of the Life Magazine type. Sandiman regards LSD as "the greatest threat facing the country today...more dangerous than the Vietnam war."

How does one go about a rational appraisal of the nonmedical use of hallucinogens? First of all, it is helpful if we temporarily shelve the attitudinal stereotypes attached to nonmedical drug use; otherwise we are immediately involved in logical inconcistencies with regard to those culturally approved drugs, alcohol and tobacco. The social implications are then determined by (1) the effects of hallucinogenic drugs, and (2) the number of persons who will use them in various degrees. The latter point is related to the type of controls that are established, but I shall defer this aspect until later.

Before going further, I shall define the term "hallucinogen" to include LSD, DMT, peyote, mescaline, psylocybin, and a host of lesser-known plants with similar psychic properties. Marihuana is a mild hallucinogen, but lacks the potent consciousness-altering qualities to warrant its inclusion in this group.

The unique feature of the strong hallucinogens is that their users, both historically and currently, attribute mental effects to the drugs that persist long after the more active phase. This is not to say that these long-lasting effects are specific to the drug; rather, given the requisite motivation and expectations, these agents purportedly aid in the rapid modification of attitudes, beliefs and values. It is this feature that led to their adoption by numerous primitive religions and cults. It is possible to use strong hallucinogens simply for their immediate effects, but they are not particularly suitable for regular use in this manner. The rapid buildup of tolerance makes it impossible to maintain the psychic effects continuously without resorting to very high doses; with normal doses, the maximum frequency of use is limited to about twice a week. In addition, since the psychic effects are quite variable, they are rather unreliable as mechanisms of escape. Finally, the strong hallucinogens have never been popular for this purpose among American Indians or other primitive groups. My argument is that the majority of those who continue to use hallucinogens will attribute their motivation to lasting as well

as immediate effects.

Keeping this feature of the drugs in mind, we can make some rational predictions about who will use hallucinogens -- that is, who will be attracted by their capacity for influencing attitudes, beliefs, and values. By far the most important variable is age. The hallucinogens are effective modifiers of personality only if a person is seeking such a change, or is at least open to it. Young people passing through what Erikson calls the period of "psychosocial moratorium" are most readily influenced. The less strongly a person is already committed to a set of beliefs, values, and goals, the more likely he is to accept as valid those he finds via the drug experience.

By the same reasoning, adults who are drawn to hallucinogenic drugs are likely to be those who, for one reason or another, find themselves alienated from the mainstream of the culture. They spurn many of the commonplace gratifications society offers, they are often strongly interested in extrasensory perception and other pararational areas and generally turn inward in search of a more meaningful existence. Highly structured, practical, conforming, outward-oriented people are very unlikely to be attracted to hallucinogenic drugs. Experimental evidence has shown that such people tend to be unwilling to try the drugs, respond very minimally if they do participate, and do not report any lasting effects from the experience. Many LSD enthusiasts are unaware of these limitations. They correctly observe that their most vocal critics have never taken LSD, but rather naively believe that everyone -- conformists and all -- would concur as to the benefits if they would only try it.

Given that we can say something about who will be attracted to hallucinogenic drugs, what are the effects of repeated use, especially the social implications? While there is considerable individual variation, the most consistent personal pattern is a lessening of concern over status, competition, material possessions, and other pursuits of the achievement oriented society. The LSD-user often describes himself as more soft, loving, and tolerant with less aggression, egocentrism, and anxiety. He believes LSD has made him more accepting of himself and others; that he is less prone to one-sided judgments in terms of good and bad, right and wrong; and is less prone to be assertive or make a strong commitment to cultural ideologies for which he himself sees no valid reason.

The amount of change and its behavioral manifestation are again a function of age, personality, and commitment to a previous set of beliefs and values. A man in his forties, with a stake in the established order, will generally not change his life pattern abruptly. He is likely to use the drug seldom and cautiously. He may find he benefits from self-insights and from lower anxiety resulting from the reduction of an unrealistically severe superego, i.e., a tendency to excessive self-criticism. He may also enjoy a new-found interest in music, art, and nature -- a sort of aesthetic "Head Start" for artistically deprived adults. He will likely have high praise for the potential benefits of hallucinogens -- but <u>only</u> when used in moderation and in a manner that is integrated with the remainder of his life. Characteristic of this type of user are people with a history of religious and other introspective interests, "friends of psychotherapy," and persons seeking to enhance their creativity in the arts.

At the other extreme is the totally uncommitted person in his teens or early twenties. He dreads the approaching monotony of a job and society's demand that he settle down and assume responsibilities. LSD may well fortify an uneasy suspicion he already entertains: that adult commitment is a meaningless, materialistic rat-race. But what was only a suspicion now takes on cosmic certainty. Unfortunately, this sort of LSD-induced "wisdom" is not accompanied by solutions for some of the basic demands of reality. He belongs to what Kenneth Keniston, in his book, The Uncommitted, calls the "cult of the present," totally absorbed with intensifying today's experience. He avoids thinking about the future, including basic economic realities. If pressed for his reasoning in this regard, he will provide rather child-like rationalizations concerning the futility of planning in an atomic age, or perhaps a belief that automation will somehow solve the world's economic problems. He may comfort himself with a vague, intuitive feeling that the world is about to metamorphose suddenly into a noncompetitive, peaceful and benevolent utopia -- all by itself, with no need for active intervention by himself or others. In short, he refuses responsibility, both for his own self-direction, and as a contributor to the existing social order.

In examining the effects of nonmedical use of hallucinogens, we should of course, take up the issue of psychotic reactions. This has generally been considered the principal source of harm, both in medical journals and the popular press. In my opinion, the capacity of hallucinogenic drugs for shaping personaliby and values (both adjustive and disruptive) is likely to have considerably more social impact than the more visible and bizarre psychotic reactions. I do not wish to minimize the danger of LSD-induced psychosis or self-destructive actions, but rather, we suggest that this is not the major social issue. The most common public image of LSD is that of a thrill drug for which one risks the possibliity of serious harm from a psychotic reaction in exchange for an exciting experience. In reality, the lasting effects appear to be more continuous -- the large majority of psychoses are in the form of anxiety panics which respond readily to treatment with tranquilizers; while, on the other hand, some frequent users who have never experienced a psychotic reaction will demonstrate very loose and unrealistic thinking. The latter reactions occur most frequently among adolescents and young adults who are overwhelmed by the drug experience and regress to primitive thinking with poor ability to cope with reality. It is also interesting to note that the transient psychotic reactions are frequently described as especially potent modifiers of personality and values.

There is no doubt that LSD can aggravate existing unstable tendencies, and occasionally precipitate a long-lasting psychosis or suicide; the stronger preparations of cannabis (marihuana) used in Eastern countries have long been recognized to have this capability. On the other hand, it appears unlikely that LSD can produce more than a temporary anxiety panic in a previously stable and well-integrated person. The probability of psychotic reactions can be markedly reduced through preparation and protective care by a knowledgeable person during the intoxication. The experience of the American Indians with peyote indicates that psychosis is very infrequent in a protected and structured setting.

Question of Controls

The proponents of hallucinogenic drug-use contend that it falls within an individual's constitutional rights; that a person should be permitted to use chemical as well as other means of consciousness alteration in the pursuit of religious experience, self-understanding, and perhaps even pleasure. Specifically, they contend that prohibition violates the First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of religion, and more generally, that it is an unwarranted invasion of privacy -- the basic right to be let alone, as set forth by the Fourteenth Amendment. They argue further that any harmful effects are confined to the individual, society not suffering directly, and that legal attempts to protect an individual from himself are basically unworkable. The issue is one of prohibition and not regulation; the constitional right of the government to regulate drugs in the public interest is not questioned.

Several Supreme Court rulings made before and after the Volstead Act pertain to the issue of individual freedom versus the protection of society from the harms of alcohol use.

> It is argued that, as the liquors are used as a beverage, and the injury following them, if taken in excess, is voluntarily inflicted and is confined to the party offending, their sale should be without restrictions, the contention being that what a man shall drink, equally with what he shall eat, is not properly a matter for legislation.
>
> There is in this position an assumption of a fact which does not exist, that when the liquors are taken in excess, the injuries are confined to the party offending. The injury, it is true, first falls upon him . . . but, as it leads to neglect of business and waste of property and general demoralization, it affects those who are immediately connected with and dependent upon him.

In another decision the Supreme Court stated:

> The ultimate legislative object of prohibition is to prevent the drinking of intoxicating liquors by anyone because of the demoralizing effect of drunkenness upon society. The state has the power to subject those members of society who might indulge in the use of such liquor without injury to themselves to a deprivation of access to liquor in order to remove temptation from those whom its use would demoralize.

Boy Bates, in article entitled "Psychedelics and the Law" has summarized the opposing viewpoint:

> Freedoms, it is understood, have a pathology of their own. They can be revelled in unwisely; that's a private affair. They can be abused to the detriment of public safety; then the law must be on hand to curb them. But they ought not to be legislated away as if adults were children of an over-anxious mother.

Of course, the above Supreme Court interpretations were made before the prohibition experiment failed, and it does not follow that the prohibition of hallucinogens would be ruled constitutional on the same grounds. If, as I have argued, the principal social impact of hallucinogens is on the personalities and values of users, the court might be asked to rule whether the state has a right to protect itself against a chemical assult on its value system, a threat that might, if sufficiently wide spread, endanger the social order.

The U.S. Supreme Court has never ruled on the constitutionality of state laws prohibiting the American Indians' religious use of peyote, but state Supreme Courts have overturned virtually all of these laws. In the most recent cases of Arizona and California, the state contended that where a religious practice conflicts with public health, e.g., the Mormons' practice of polygamy, the religious practice must yield. The courts, however, ruled the state must show that the practice is "frustrating a compelling interest of the state" before it can justifiably abridge the guarantee of religious freedom; and in the court's opinion the state had not so shown in the case of the Indians' ritual use of peyote. The decisions were based entirely on the issue of religious freedom; as for other uses of peyote, the California court stated, "We do not doubt that even though technically peyote is an 'hallucinogen' rather than a narcotic, the state, pursuant to the police power, may prescribe its use." It would perhaps be premature to conclude that the California courts would sanction the religious use of LSD and other hallucinogens by non-Indians. The Indians, at least, have the precedent of a long cultural history on their side. Peyotism is the commonest religion among the American Indians; the religious use of peyote dates back to at least 1560, with an established church for the past 50 years; they use peyote within a highly prescribed religious ritual; and finally, they are a primitive culture with very little impact on society as a whole. Nevertheless, the California decision did not rule out the use of peyote by non-Indians, stating the "trial courts will have to determine in each instance, with whatever evidence is at hand, whether or not the assertion of a belief which is protected by the First Amendment is <u>in fact</u> a spurious claim."

Constitutionality is not the only question involved in a rational approach to drug control, as the prohibition era so vividly demonstrated. The Harrison Act sharply reduced narcotic addiction, but created serious new social problems. Among students and certain other groups, the marihuana laws are increasingly being regarded with the kind of disrespect that followed the prohibition of alcohol. Prohibiting the stronger hallucinogens may create even more disrespect, especially among users who associate their use with various socially-sanctioned benefits.

In rationally examining the consequences of legal repression as a method of drug control, we should consider (1) the consequences of unrestricted use or of nonpunitive controls; (2) whether the laws are enforceable; (3) whether the prescribed punishment is commensurate with the "offense," which is to say, whether it is consistent with that imposed for other offenses; and (4) the value of deterrence versus the law's unintended side effects.

On the first point, we already know a great deal about the social effects of the unrestricted use of alcohol. Alcoholism is generally attributed to previously existing psychopathology or social alienation. The basic question is whether, if alcohol were unavailable, problem drinkers would simply resort

to equally deleterious outlets. A corollary to this question is whether legalizing such a drug as marihuana would compound social problems by increasing the number of persons using drugs to excess. If those who abuse marihuana were drawn from the population of alcoholics, there is a sound argument for expecting an improvement in the social situation, at least, in terms of the resulting physiological damage. It is true that few persons use both drugs to excess. On the other hand, it has been argued that alcohol and marihuana satisfy different needs and the resulting abuse would be additive. The strong hallucinogens are not suitable for producing the continual intoxication that is possible with alcohol and marihuana. While it is too early to adequately assess the capacity for abuse of the strong hallucinogens, there is some reason to believe it would be fairly minimal for adults, but appreciable among the less-restrained younger group. By "abuse" I mean, primarily, repeated use resulting in undesirable personality effects.

Regarding the second point, the enforcement of LSD prohibitions will certainly produce some formidable problems, considering that one ounce of the colorless, tasteless, odorless liquid is sufficient for 300,000 doses. It is much easier to smuggle LSD than Heroin or marihuana; and prosecution at the seller level will have more influence on price than on availability. The possibilities for concealment, such as absorption on a page of a book or a piece of cloth, may make it impossible to enforce the laws against possession.

On the third point, the gross inconsistencies in the laws controlling drugs are undeniable. For instance, peyote, mescaline, LSD, and psilocybin are virtually indistinguishable in their psychic effects, but the patchwork California laws permit peyote for Indians (and perhaps for serious non-Indians), define mescaline as a narcotic and impose the same severe penalties as for heroin use, treat LSD as a dangerous drug with a misdemeanor charge for possession, and do not cover psilocybin at all. At the same time, marihuana -- so mild a hallucinogen that it cannot be logically included in the above group -- is treated as a narcotic, with some violations requiring mandatory prison sentences of 5 to 10 years. Add to this confusion the fact that the consumption of alcohol is promoted with the full power of American advertising, and the illogic becomes rather appalling.

On the final point, we ask to what extent legal repression will deter the use of hallucinogens, and how this is balanced against the law's unwanted side-effects. Some have argued that outlawing drugs that are considered relatively harmless merely enhances their attractiveness among rebellious young groups. While this may be true, there can be little doubt that, overall, laws that are enforced do reduce drug usage. Availability is a precondition for use, and easy availability without legal complications will result in more widespread use than will occur under illicit conditions. Even the widely flouted prohibition laws are acknowledged to have reduced the total alcohol consumption (although perhaps not the total abuse), and the strikingly higher rate of narcotic addiction among members of the medical profession over that for the general population attests to the effectiveness of the narcotic laws in reducing overall usage.

It is important to ask not only how effective a law is as a deterrent, but also who the individuals are who do not conform. Persons breaking the laws on opiates come very largely from socially and economically deprived groups who demonstrate a high rate of deviancy in non-drug areas. Until recent

years, the use of marihuana was also largely confined to these groups (except for jazz musicians). In the last few years, there has been a rapid spread of marihuana use to college students and various other middle and upper socioeconomic groups who have not heretofore had a general pattern of deviance. LSD was introduced into the society through scientific and medical sources, and up to now has apparently not spread to the lower social groups. This, combined with the fact that many persons using LSD are seriously motivated by hopes of solving personal problems or achieving some other lasting benefit, means that a substantial number of the persons violating LSD laws will not be deviant in other respects.

At a recent conference on LSD, Joseph Lohman, Dean of the University of California (Berkeley) School of Criminology, and former Sheriff of Cook County, Ill., pointed out that this situation leads to several undesirable side-effects. First, some students and other persons who are not basically antisocial will suffer arrest records, social stigma, and other personal harm. Second, it breeds a subculture with hostility to the law, which may generalize to secondary patterns of deviance. Third, it creates and supports organized crime as a source of supply. Fourth, it causes poor quality-control of the drug, which may result in overdoses or poisonous adulterations. Lastly, persons needing medical attention as a result of drug-induced reactions may not apply for it because they fear arrest.

Selective enforcement is another problem with drug laws that do not have the full support of the population, courts and police. The marihuana laws are frequently not enforced because the harsh penalties are in poor social perspective. Police frequently overlook student use of the drug, and the courts decline to prosecute. At worst, this situation can supply law-enforcement agencies with a lever to attach other types of behavior that are unpopular but not illegal; at best, it results in gross inequality of treatment between certain lower classes under close surveillance of the law and students and upper socioeconomic groups who may use the drug with virtual impunity.

Future of Hallucinogenic Drugs

The civilized world was first introduced to the strong hallucinogens around 1900. After taking a small single dose of peyote in 1896, a noted physician, Weir Mitchell, wrote:

> I predict a perilous reign of the mescal (peyote) habit when this agent becomes attainable. The temptation to call again the enchanting magic of the experience will, I am sure, be too much for some men to resist after they have once set foot in this land of fairy colours, where there seems to be so much to charm and so little to excite horror and disgust.

A year later, Havelock Ellis described the effects of three peyote buttons as an "artificaal paradise" and noted: "I fully agree with Dr. Weir Mitchell that there is every likelihood that mescal will become popular." Ellis was attacked in the British Medical Journal for painting too attractive a picture of peyote: "We must venture to point out that such eulogy of any drug is a danger to the public . . . Surely this is putting temptation before that section of the public which is always in search of a new sensation." The Literary Digest joined in with lurid warnings of the "gigantic

problem of spread to whites of this 'dry whiskey.'"

Why were these predictions some seventy years in fulfillment? The bitter taste and nausea-producing effects of peyote are deterrants, but this problem was resolved with the synthesis of mescaline in 1919. One hypothesis is that hallucinogens have recently become popular because America's achievement-oriented belief system has weakened. Several authors have concluded that cultural differences strongly influence the choice between alchol and cannabis (marihuana) as an intoxicant. Cannabis is more popular in cultures that tolerate social inaction, alcohol in cultures that place a high value on action. Horton has found that, in the large majority of primitive cultures, alcohol releases aggressive actions; cannabis typically results in quiet euphoria, and prolonged regular use leads to a more passive personality.

While there are no cross-cultural comparisons available among civilized groups in the case of the strong hallucinogens, there is good reason to believe that their use will be even more influenced by cultural values than is cannabis. The latter is used for religious meditation by some groups in India and elsewhere, but most users are motivated by the immediate euphoric effects. Cannabis is a reliable euphoriant since its effect is easily controlled, and consumption by smoking allows the experienced user to gauge accurately the amount absorbed. Furthermore, there is little build-up of tolerance, so the user may repeat it at will. With the strong hallucinogens, much less control and direction is possible and euphoria is only a part of the experience. As mentioned earlier, most users will state that they are motivated to obtain personal understanding, philosophical insights, and various other phenomena considered to have lasting value. Alcohol and, to some extent, cannabis, provide a temporary escape from reality. On the other hand, the user of the strong hallucinogens frequently regards the drug-induced state more real in many ways than his normal reality, and values any carryover that may result--thus the ideal for the LSD enthusiast is to remain "turned on" when not under effect of the drug. The hallmark of the LSD experience is freedom from absolutes and dualities; good and evil, right and wrong merge into a single oneness. It is this viewpoint that impels the user to see all normal endeavors as "games," and the loss of this perspective as a "hangup." A precondition for the acceptance of this position is the lack of a firm commitment to another belief system; hence the argument that the recent popularity of hallucinogens is due to alienation from the conventional Western value system.

Keniston attributes the alienation of American youth to such sources as loss of historical relatedness, chronic social change, and the exacting demands of a technological age. He differentiates between those who are alienated through their inability to meet society's demands and those who choose not to do so. Persons currently attracted to LSD come primarily from the latter group.

The future use of hallucinogens is contingent on the degree of legal repression and, if the above-described thesis is correct, a continuing trend away from the achieving society. For instance, an all-out war effort would probably reverse the present trend. It appears unlikely that more than a small minority of today's adults will ever become regular users of hallucinogens simply because the effects do not accord with their value system. The amount of potential use among today's youth is much more uncertain. The use of hallucinogens among this group is accompanied by a

Utopian-type movement with a philosophy which is similar, but not synonymous, to that of the New Left. It contains components of hedonism, humanism and existentialism, but its most characteristic feature is passive detachment. It seems unlikely that there will ever be an organized psychedelic capable of exercising political pressure. The personalities attracted, as well as the effects of hallucinogens, are directly opposite to those required for an activist approach and their use has reportedly depleted the ranks of certain liberal movements. A case in point is the recent attempt of a California group to legalize marihuana via the initiative route. They received wide publicity--but no one ever got around to getting the petition forms printed, let alone the collection of one-half million signatures.

In spite of the absence of activist groups, the legal position is showing some softening. Federal legislation is toward control of drug manufacture and distribution, with less repression at the user level. Barring a reversal of this trend, the severity of the marihuana laws against possession should be sharply reduced within the next few years. There is general recognition that most of the social harms attributed to marihuana have been grossly exaggerated. The only accusation still given serious consideration is that marihuana serves as a stepping stone to heroin addiction. Even this argument for a repressive law is rather weak since, as Alfred Lindesmith has pointed out, it punishes a person not for what he has done, but rather for what someone thinks he might do. There is certainly no indication of progression to heroin among college marihuana users. It is difficult to see how the gross incongruity in legal treatment between LSD and marihuana can continue.

The logical inconsistency running through the drug laws of this country has always been that they are, in fact, attempts to legislate morality, but are justified on the grounds that they prevent antisocial acts. It is understandable that an achieving society should shudder at the spectre of withdrawal into the fantasies of the opium den; but since laws directly prohibiting this type of choice do not fit the democratic model, we associate drug use with various crimes and justify prohibition on these grounds. Criminal sanctions against the use of strong hallucinogens are especially difficult to justify in this manner, since users frequently claim to have reaped drug-induced benefits that are in the best Judeo-Christian tradition. This very dilemma continually frustrated the missionaries who led the attack against peyotism among the American Indians during the early part of the century. As the peyote cult became more Christianized, the Bible was placed on the altar along with a large peyote button called the "father peyote." Particularly irksome to the missionaries was the practice of quoting various Bible passages on the eating of herbs, which the Indians interpreted as peyote. Apparently, the reports of LSD-induced consciousness expansion are equally irksome to government officials: FDA Chief Goddard recently dismissed this claim as "sheer bunk."

In spite of Goddard's assessment, most attempts at comparing natural and hallucinogen-induced mystical experiences have concluded they are indistinguishable in content. It does not follow, of course, that they have the same impact on personality, since preparation and commitment are often considered to be an essential part of such approaches. Nevertheless, serious attempts to use strong hallucinogens in a religious setting probably stand the best chance of social acceptance in the near future. Several groups are already proceeding along these lines.

Another suggestion that has been advanced is that controlled use of hallucinogens be permitted in special centers with or without a religious orientation. This would provide several advantages over the present situation: the provision of medical supervision, quality control of the drug, a pleasant and supportive environment, and some structure as to the frequency of use.

The most serious social conflict between users and nonusers of hallucinogens is likely to be one of economics. I have already mentioned that many of the young persons who form the major part of the LSD or psychedelic movement have a very unrealistic lack of concern about the economic facts of life. They choose not to participate in a technological society, but are vague on how they plan to make a living. They are contemptuous of the "square" world, but at the same time depend on its high standard of living. An affluent society can support a sizeable number of such "disaffiliates," but whether it will choose to do so is another question. The conforming majority are more or less willing to support people who are genuinely unfitted for meeting their own needs; they are much less willing to support the able-bodied who politely decline to participate; and they may hotly refuse to tolerate a group that rejects work, takes drugs, and ridicules its benefactors.

The alienation in today's youth does not stem from the use of hallucinogens, but the drugs do tend to reinforce their overall detachment from society. The major question is whether this alienation will persist into adulthood. Leslie Fiedler concludes that it is a permanent condition--that a new breed of "mutants" has been brought about by advanced technology, aided by LSD. If we conducted a follow-up study of the beatniks of the Fifties, we could probably foretell the destinies of today's alienated LSD-users. It is easy to conceive of new generations of youth passing through a disaffiliate stage; it is more difficult to visualize a similar group in their forties. The overreactions of the psychedelic movement are characteristic of youthful rebellion. In their eagerness to escape the materialistic brainwashing imposed by the culture, they have also tended to become oblivious to the personal satisfaction resulting from accomplishment. The LSD movement also has a strong anti-intellectual component. There is a failure to recognize that one may suspend the objective rational functions of the mind when they are inappropriate without completely depriving oneself of this essential means of coping with reality. Age can normally be expected to reveal the fallacies of a free-loading existence, as well as the satisfaction of achievement and the usefulness of a rational approach. One reason for the missionary zeal among current LSD-users is that perhaps 90 per cent of the persons who have taken the drug during the 23 years since its discovery have done so in the past year. Overenthusiasm is characteristic of the initiate; it is much less evident among those exposed five to ten years ago.

Another viewpoint is that chemistry is on the side of the drug-taker--that the current crop of hallucinogens is only the first generation of a long series of consciousness-alerting drugs with more specific effects and less undesirable consequences. The Director of NIMH, Dr. Stanley Yolles, recently predicted a hundred-fold increase in drugs that affect the mind in the next ten years. According to this view, the rational individual would choose from a large selection of consciousness-altering drugs according to the particular effect he desires. Alcohol might remain the most widely used,

but by no means the only, socially accepted drug.

In spite of the current LSD panic and the resulting hasty legislation in some states, the rigidly defined good and bad roles of drugs are probably nearing an end, and legal repression at the user level seems likely to be markedly reduced in the not too distant future. On the other hand, society will continue to express its disapproval of cultist withdrawal centered around the use of drugs, and such groups are no more likely to prove viable than the numerous other utopian movements throughout history. Individuals who seek pleasure or personal growth through consciousness altering drugs, and pursue these goals within the social order, will likely enjoy increasing social acceptance.